

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/538,322	06/10/2005	Arthur F. Clark	11044-0003	1549	
22902	7590 07/27/2006		EXAMINER		
CLARK & B	RODY NT AVENUE, NW	MANOHARAN, VIRGINIA			
SUITE 250	IVI AVENOE, IVV	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			1764		
			DATE MAIL ED: 07/27/200	ć	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/538,32	22	CLARK, ARTHUR F.		
		Examiner		Art Unit		
		Virginia M		1764		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ansions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after the provided by the Office later than three months after t	DATE OF THE R 1.136(a). In no even in the control of the control o	HIS COMMUNICATION  The control of th	ON.  imely filed  m the mailing date of this communication.  IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10	0 June 2005.				
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Qu	ayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from coi				
Applicati	ion Papers					
9) 10)	The specification is objected to by the Exam The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) the drawing(s) b rection is require	e held in abeyance. Seed if the drawing(s) is of	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have bee ents have bee priority docume reau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applica ents have been receive e 17.2(a)).	tion Noved in this National Stage		
Attachmen	ut(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)		
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Infon	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ er No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail [			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required. The abstract in the PCT does not suffice.

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors, e.g., typographical, grammar, idiomatic, syntax and etc. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a). The phrase "very high boiling" in claim 2 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The phrase is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.
- b). The claimed "to means for separating said target from said solvent" in claim 3, line 2 lacks proper antecedent support in the claims.
- c). The "target component" in claim 7 is at odds with the "distillation process" of claim 1, the claim from which it depends. [A dependent claim incorporates every feature(s) of the

Application/Control Number: 10/538,322

Art Unit: 1764

claim from which it depends and can not change or orient the limitation already recited in the independent claim].

Claim 7 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The component recited in claim 7 does not add any process/method steps to the process of claim 1.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over anyone of Cox et al (4,225,394), O'Donnell et al (5,064,507) or Bowes (5,162,081).

Obviously, anyone of the above references anticipates or renders obvious the target component claimed in claim 7, as each also separates the target component by the same process as claimed e.g., in claim 1.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Cox or O'Donnell et al.

Art Unit: 1764

Cox or O'Donnell is deemed to anticipates or renders obvious the claimed "distillation process comprising providing a mixture of a lower boiling point solvent and a higher boiling point target compound to an evaporator, flashing off a multi-component vapor containing said solvent and said target at a temperature below the boiling point of said target compound, subsequently separating said target from said mixture, and providing additional amounts of said solvent without said target to said evaporator" as broadly claimed in claim 1. See Fig. 1 of Cox, and the claims at cols. 8-12 of O' Donnell.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowes in view of Cox et or O'Donnell.

Bowes discloses the process as claimed. See Fig. 1. The process of Bowes differs from the claimed invention in that claim 1, for example, discloses the flash evaporation step followed by distillation to separate out the target component. However, the above combination of flash evaporation and distillation steps are known in the art as taugh by Cox and O"Donnell, discussed supra. To combine the references would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since all the refrences are directed to the same processing environment of distillation.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a). Rowland discloses a distillation process and apparatus for concentrating aqueous solutions.
- b). Lyon et al discloses a combined flashing and distillation process.

Application/Control Number: 10/538,322

Art Unit: 1764

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to V. Manoharan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1450.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VIRGINIA MANOHARAN PRIMARY EXAMINER

ARTUNIT 138 ( Tag
7/22/06

Page 5